



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Cen

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,500	08/05/2003	Marie B. O'Regan	CL2332USNA	8660
23906 7590 09/13/2007 E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			EXAMINER HINES, ANNE M	
			ART UNIT 2879	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,500

Applicant(s)

O'REGAN ET AL.

Examiner

Anne M. Hines

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 24, 2007 has been entered.

Claims 1-12 are pending in the instant application.

Priority

The instant application claims priority from provisional applications 60/462217, filed April 11, 2003, and 60/401257, filed August 6, 2002. Upon review of the provisional applications with regard to the claimed invention of independent claim 1, the Examiner finds that the claimed invention of claim 1 is not disclosed in provisional application 60/401257; specifically this provisional application fails to disclose three adjacent layers of transparent polymer, wherein the laminated polymer is flexible, and each pair of adjacent layers is separated by a transparent solid non-glass interlayer or an air-cavity containing a device. The Examiner finds that the claimed invention of independent claim 1 is disclosed by provisional application 60/462217. Therefore, the effective filing date of claims 1-12 is April 11, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Daniels (US 6876143).

Regarding claim 1, Daniels discloses a laminated polymer comprised of at least three adjacent layers of transparent polymer, wherein the laminated polymer is flexible and can be adapted to various shapes and forms (Fig. 21, 24; Column 7, lines 58-59; Column 10, lines 15-18; Column 25, line 60; Column 2, lines 14-16; Column 14, lines 48-58), wherein each pair of adjacent layers is separated by a solid non-glass interlayer (Fig. 21, 12; Column 17, lines 38-43; Column 14, lines 48-58) containing at least one element from the group consisting of solid state lighting, heat sensors, light sensors, pressure sensors, thin film capacitance sensors, photovoltaic cells, thin film batteries, liquid crystal display films, suspended particle device films, and transparent electrical conductors (Fig. 21, 'OLED').

Regarding claim 2, Daniels further discloses wherein the laminated polymer has three layers of transparent polymer with adjacent layers of a transparent polymer separated by a transparent solid non-glass interlayer (Fig. 21, 24 & 12; Column 17, lines 38-43; Column 14, lines 48-58).

Regarding claim 3, Daniels further discloses wherein at least one of the devices comprises solid state lighting (Fig. 21, 'OLED').

Regarding claim 4, Daniels further discloses wherein the solid state lighting is in the form of a light emitting diode (Fig. 21, 'OLED').

Regarding claim 5, Daniels further discloses wherein the solid state lighting is an organic light emitting diode (Fig. 21, 'OLED').

Regarding claim 6, Daniels further discloses wherein the solid state lighting is in the form of an electroluminescent film (Fig. 21, 'OLED').

Regarding claim 7, Daniels further discloses wherein at least one of the devices further comprises transparent electrical conductors to provide means to apply an activating voltage to the solid state lighting (Column 2, line 66 to Column 3, line 1).

Regarding claim 9, Daniels further discloses wherein the at least one device further comprises a microprocessor chip that is programmed to control the solid state lighting to cause it to display a sequence of images (Fig. 1; Column 10, lines 43-67).

Regarding claim 10, Daniels further discloses wherein the microprocessor chip is programmed to cause the solid state lighting to display text (Fig. 1; Column 10, lines 43-67).

Regarding claim 11, Daniels further discloses wherein there is provided externally to the laminated polymer a microprocessor chip that is programmed to control the solid state lighting and to cause the solid state lighting to display a sequence of images (Fig. 1; Column 10, lines 43-67).

Regarding claim 12, Daniels further discloses wherein the microprocessor chip is programmed to cause the solid state lighting to display text (Fig. 1; Column 10, lines 43-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels (US 6876143) in view of Forrest et al. (US 6198091).

Regarding claim 8, Daniels teaches the invention of claim 7, including wherein the electrical conductors are transparent, but is silent regarding the material of the transparent conductors.

In the same field of endeavor of OLED devices with transparent conductors, Forrest teaches wherein a transparent conductor for an OLED is ITO in order to provide an electrode that is transparent to visible light and has a good conductivity (Column 5, lines 20-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Daniels to have the transparent electrodes be ITO in order to provide an electrode that is transparent to visible light and has a good conductivity, as disclosed by Forrest.

Art Unit: 2879

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Hines whose telephone number is (571) 272-2285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Anne M Hines
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879



MARICELI SANTIAGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER